

### REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 17-20 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and continued examination are respectfully requested.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 15, 16, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,657,199 (Devoe). Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 1 as amended recites:

A resonance filter, comprising:  
at least three multilayer capacitors having at least two different capacitances, the at least three multilayer capacitors being adjacent to each other at the same layer;  
wherein two capacitors of the at least three multilayer capacitors have a same capacitance, the two capacitors being on outer ends of an arrangement formed by the at least three multilayer capacitors;  
wherein the at least three electrode multilayer capacitors comprise a stack of dielectric layers; and electrode layers in the stack, the dielectric layers and the electrode layers forming a component;  
wherein external contacts on faces of the component correspond to electrode layers in the component;  
wherein the capacitors, the inductance of the electrode layers and of the external contacts, form LC filters.

Devoe teaches a noise filter including parallel capacitors (Devoe, Figure 2). The capacitors are arranged on top of one another and not **adjacent to each other at the same layer** as taught by claim 1 as amended. Further, because the capacitors are arranged as shown in Figure 2, when formed into a component they could not possibly provide that **external contacts on faces of the**

**component correspond to electrode layers in the component** as similarly taught by claim 1 as amended. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-4, 6-10, 15, and 16 are all variously dependent on claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claims 2-4, 6-10, 15, and 16.

Claims 1, 11, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,172,299 (Yamada). Applicants respectfully disagree. Yamada teaches a multilayer capacitor with a plurality of inner electrodes. Yamada fails to teach or suggest **wherein the capacitors, the inductance of the electrode layers and of the external contacts, form LC filters**. There is simply no mention of LC filters anywhere in Yamada. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 1.

Claim 11 is dependent on claim 1, and is therefore allowable with respect to Yamada for at least the same reasons given for claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 11.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claim 5 is rejected as being unpatentable over Devoe as applied to claim 3 is further view of Japanese Application Publication No. JP40720163A (Harada). Claim 5 is dependent on claim 1. As stated above with respect to claim 1, Devoe fails to teach or suggest the **at least three multilayer capacitors adjacent to each other at the same layer**. Figure 2 of Harada clearly

shows capacitors arranged on top of one another and not adjacent in the same layer. Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 5.

Claim 12 is rejected as being unpatentable over Devoe as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of US Patent No. 4,947,286 (Kaneko). Claim 12 is dependent on claim 1, and is therefore allowable for the reasons given above for claim 1 with respect to Devoe. Kaneko fails to cure the deficiencies of Devoe. Kaneko teaches a multilayered capacitor (Kaneko, Abstract). Kaneko entirely fails to teach three multilayer capacitors adjacent to each other at the same layer. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 12.

Claim 13 is rejected as being unpatentable over Devoe as applied to claim 3 in view of US Patent No. 3,617,834 (Rayburn). Claim 13 is dependent on claim 1, and is therefore allowable for the reasons given above for claim 1 with respect to Devoe. Rayburn fails to cure the deficiencies of Devoe. Rayburn teaches a monolithic ceramic capacitor (Rayburn, Abstract). Rayburn entirely fails to teach three multilayer capacitors adjacent to each other in the same layer. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 13.

Claim 14 is rejected as being unpatentable over Devoe as applied to claim 3 above, further in view of US Patent No 4,729,058 (Gupta). Claim 14 is dependent on claim 1, and is therefore allowable for the reasons given above for claim 1 with respect to Devoe. Gupta fails to cure the deficiencies of Devoe. Gupta teaches "a self-limiting ceramic capacitor characterized by high capacitance and transient voltage protective properties comprising a plurality of thin

layers of a zinc oxide-based ceramic material having non-linear resistance characteristics with each layer having a conductive coating on at least one surface thereof and the coated ceramic layers sintered together to form a laminated stack” (Gupta, Abstract). Gupta entirely fails to teach three multilayer capacitors adjacent to each other at the same layer. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 14.

### Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and requests that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance. It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fee is believed due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Gunter Engel et al.  
Serial No. : 10/526,687  
Filed : November 8, 2005  
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 14219-082US1 / P2002,0740 US N

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

11/28/77



\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael W. Tieff  
Reg. No. 57,845

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
P.O. Box 1022  
Minneapolis, MN 55440-1022  
Telephone: (302) 652-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945